

Overview of Activities from Fall 2016 Sabbatical

Nancy L. Leech

Professor

Research and Evaluation Methods

Planned for Sabbatical

- Analyze and submit for publication already collected data from faculty in higher education institutions regarding their research vitality, motivation to conduct research, and motivation to teach.
- Analyze and submit for publication a data set collected from teachers in three school districts in the state of Colorado to explore teachers' motivation to teach in a climate where there is significant conflict with school boards.
- Begin a new study to research students in higher education who have been homeschooled regarding their perceptions of teaching and learning in a higher education setting.

Additional Projects

- Completed content validity for new survey on the LRT (survey to measure linguistic responsiveness of teachers). This work came out of eCALLMS
- Started work on new grant (ICMEE – Dr. Kara Viesca at UNL is PI)
- Collected data from teachers at private schools in Colorado
- Completed revision of Gliner, Morgan, and Leech (3rd edition) published by Taylor and Francis
- Completed revision of Instructor's manual for Gliner, Morgan, and Leech (3rd edition) published by Taylor and Francis
- School Psychology Quarterly (SPQ) Associate Editor work
- Oxford Bibliography Editorial Board work

Factors Influencing Teaching Choice (FIT-Choice)

- Developed by Watt and Richardson (2007) to help understand why pre-service students chose to become teachers
- The FIT-Choice scale has three factors: (1) motivations for teaching, (2) perceptions of teaching, and (3) reasons to become a teacher.
- Multiple countries with pre-service teachers: for example, China and the United States (Lin et al., 2012); Australia (Watt & Richardson, 2007); Norway, Germany, Australia, and the United States (Watt et al., 2012), Switzerland (Berger & D'Ascoli, 2012), and the Netherlands (Fokkens-Bruinsma & Canrinus, 2012).
- My co-authors and I were the first to use the FIT-Choice with in-service teachers.

FIT-Choice Factors

Motivations for teaching

- 1) ability
- 2) intrinsic career value
- 3) work with children and adolescents
- 4) enhance social equity
- 5) time for family
- 6) shape future of children/adolescents
- 7) fallback career
- 8) job security
- 9) prior teaching and learning experiences
- 10) social influences
- 11) job transferability
- 12) make social contribution.

Perceptions of teaching

- 1) expertise (i.e., the level of knowledge needed for the job)
- 2) difficulty (e.g., how heavy the workload would be)
- 3) social status (e.g., how respected the teaching profession is perceived)
- 4) salary (e.g., if teachers are perceived to be paid well).

Reasons to become a teacher

- 1) Social dissuasion (e.g., if others encouraged other professions)
- 2) satisfaction with choice of becoming a teacher

Your turn...

- Please indicate the number (1 not at all important in your decision, 2,3,4,5,6, 7 extremely important in your decision) that best describes the importance of each of the following items.

- "I CHOSE TO BECOME A TEACHER BECAUSE..."

- Teaching will allow me to shape young adult's/adult's values.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

- Teaching will allow me to influence the next generation.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

- Teaching will allow me to have an impact on young adults/adults .

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

- **For each item below, please rate the extent to which YOU agree it is true about teaching, from 1 (not at all) to 7 (extremely).**

- Do you think teaching requires high levels of expert knowledge?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

- Do you think teachers need high levels of technical knowledge?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

- Do you think teachers need highly specialized knowledge?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Statistically Significant Differences Between In-Service Teachers (N = 229, Author, 2015) and the Current Study (N = 95).

	<i>Current</i>		<i>In-Service</i>						
	<i>Study of</i>		<i>Teachers</i>						
	<i>Higher</i>		<i>Author</i>						
	<i>Education</i>		<i>(2015)</i>						
	<i>Faculty</i>								
Sub-factor	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	95% CL		<i>d</i>
Shape Future	5.34	1.29	5.83	1.05	-3.70	<.001	-.75	-.23	-.44
Expertise	5.93	.81	5.55	1.63	4.65	<.001	.22	.55	.26

|

Results

- Statistically significant differences were found on eight subfactors between in-service teachers and higher education faculty. On seven of those eight subfactors, in-service K-12 teachers scored higher (i.e., ability, intrinsic career value, job security, job transferability, shape future of children and adolescents, social influences, and work with children and adolescents).
- The remaining subfactor where a statistically significance difference was detected was on “expertise,” where higher education faculty had a higher mean.

Articles Submitted

Leech, N. L., Haug, C. A., Ridgewell, N., & Rubin, W. (In review).

Motivation to teach in the current climate: An examination of three school districts in transition. *Urban Education*.

Leech, N. L., Schnittka, J., & Haug, C. A. (In review). Earning tenure with outstanding teaching: Using logistic regression to understand how demographic variables and the FIT-Choice scale predict success. *Studies in Higher Education*.

Leech, N. L., Viesca, K. M., & Haug, C. A. (In review). Motivation to teach for higher education faculty: Validating the FIT-Choice Scale. *Research in Higher Education*.